DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 291 SO 010 755

TITLE	Adult Political Education in West Germany and the United States: Papers and Discussion. German Studies Notes.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Inst. of German Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Volkswagen Foundation, Hanover (West Germany).
PUB DATE	Apr 77
NOTE	34p.; For related documents, see SO 010 752-754; Papers presented at the Conference on "West Germany and the United States: A Systems Comparison Analysis" (Bloomington, Indiana, April 12-17, 1977)
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of German Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 ($1.50 plus $0.25 postage and handling, paper cover)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Adult Education Programs; *Adult Students; Attitudes; Citizen Participation; Civics; *Comparative Education; Conference Reports; Cross Cultural Studies; Curriculum Development; Decision Making; Discussion Groups; Educational Objectives; Educational Practice; Evaluation; Futures (of Society); Government Role; *Political Attitudes; *Political Science; Political Socialization; Program Descriptions; Relevance (Education); Speeches; Values
IDENTIFIERS	United States; West Germany

ABSTRACT

The document presents the text of two speeches and a group discussion of adult political education in the United States and Germany from a conference to compare recent social, economic, and political developments in the two countries. The first speech characterizes adult political education in Germany as comprising approximately 10% of the total adult education program. A clear relationship is indicated between recent demands for political education and disillusionment with highly industrialized mass society. Review of ten political education curricula currently in use reveals high interest among adults in West Germany in business, the family in modern society, educational policy, citizen action, the social market economy, and European integration. The second speech focuses on the United States and explains recent adult education demands as a result of dissatisfaction with corporate authority and a demand for citizen participation at all levels of decision making. The third report presents a discussion by German and American educators, government officials, and spokesmen from political institutes of the first two papers. Topics discussed include the relationship between political action and political learning, causes of the renaissance of interest in adult political education, cultural environment, and changes in adult political perspectives as a result of political education. The conclusion is that additional data on the nature of participation in adult education programs is necessary before valid cross-cultural comparisons can be made. (Author/DB)

ED151291

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Institute of German Studies
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ADULT POLITICAL EDUCATION

in

WEST GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

Papers and Discussion

German Studies Notes Published by the Institute of German Studies/Indiana University

Indiana University
Ballantine Hall 666
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

SO 010 755

Bloomington, Indiana: Institute of German Studies, 1977

Published with the support of the Stiftung Volkswagenwerk.

Copyright 1977 by the Institute of German Studies
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47401

The papers in this volume were presented in Session 12: Political Education, at the Conference on "West Germany and the United States: A Systems Comparison Analysis," held at Indiana University, April 12-17, 1977. This conference was part of a comparative research and publications project on the two countries, under a grant from Stiftung Volkswagenwerk.

The discussion following the papers is an edited version.

The authors

Dr. Dieter Schmidt-Sinns heads the Department of Didactics of Political Education in the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 53 Bonn, Berliner Freiheit 7, West Germany.

Dr. Edward Schwartz directs the Institute for the Study of Civic Values, 401 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19108.

The Project Focus on Education was coordinated by Dr. Howard Mehlinger, Director of the Social Science Development Center at Indiana University.

German Studies Notes make available to interested persons and institutions a variety of research reports and working papers produced for the Systems Comparison Project on West Germany and the United States. Topics relate to socio-political and socio-economic questions, problems of fiscal policy, political and vocational education, the environment, the mass media, German-American relations, German Culture Studies in America, and other broadly cultural themes.

Inquiries regarding project publications should be addressed to the Institute of German Studies.

Eberhard Reichmann
Project Director and Editor-in-Chief

SESSION 12:

ADULT POLITICAL EDUCATION

IN

WEST GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

Opening Remarks:

Welcome to this Conference on Political Education. Three years ago, when the Institute of German Studies received a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation to look at Contemporary American and German developments, I was asked to serve as the Education Coordinator, responsible for planning. We elected to focus on the topic "Political Education" (the German term being Politische Bildung). While political education is a literal translation of that term, there are some differences in the semantic meaning between the two. But nevertheless, political education seemed like a perfectly reasonable and sensible term to be used with an American audience, and it seemed to fit some of the special interests of groups here at Indiana University. So, throughout the grant period, we have been focusing on the idea of political education.

In September, 1975, we held a week-long conference in Bloomington for twenty American and fifteen German specialists in political education. The focus was on sort of a rationale for political education in the two societies, and on the specific examination of school practices and curriculum materials being developed for political education in the two societies. Several papers given at this conference have been published in German by the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung (in: Schriftenreihe, No. 115, 1977). In October 1977 there will be a follow-up meeting in Germany, sponsored by the Bundeszentrale, concerned with linking political socialization with political education. Therefore, one of the efforts of this Systems Comparison Project--to facilitate comparison back and forth and to maintain scholarly dialogue--is continuing. I am grateful to the Bundeszentrale for their efforts in furthering this process. Now, today we're making another effort to follow-up that September 1975 conference but limited to just two segments. We are looking at political education in out-of-school settings, that is, at adult political education.

Indiana University

Howard Mehlinger

ADULT POLITICAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Dieter Schmidt-Sinns

A. Organization and Context of Adult Political Education

One can hardly understand the adult political education curricula without a knowledge of the complex organizational structures of adult education in the Federal Republic of Germany. Outsiders are presented with an intricate field of various governmental, semi-governmental, and private authorities and sponsors that makes an assessment of political education in this area complicated. According to the German Council of Education: "On the whole there is a lack of information concerning the number, educational preparation, social composition and motivations of the participants of continuing education programs ... The lack of coordinated responsibility results in a gap and redundancies in adult continuing education programs, leading to an uneconomical use of resources."[1] Thus, we will limit ourselves to a presentation of some essential organizational structures, present a survey of the theories of political education since around 1950, and, finally, discuss two specific projects in some detail.

Among sponsors, a distinction is made between government, organizations (Federal Center for Political Education, state Centers for Political Education -"Landes Zentralen"-, adult education centers) and independent organizations. This last category includes the four large party-oriented foundations (Friedrich Ebert Foundation of the Social Democratic Party, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation of the Christian Democratic Union, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation of the Free Democratic Party, the Hanns Seidel Foundation of the Christian Social Union) and educational facilities which are maintained by trade unions, church organizations and other private organizations.

There are about 1200 adult education centers in the Federal Republic with 4000 branch centers. According to the official statutes concerning adult education, political education is designated to be an important part of their work; it makes up about 10% of the total program. In comparison, language instruction makes up about 25% of the program, home economics, 10%, literature and art, 5%. As far as method is concerned, the work of adult education is still carried out almost exclusively through semester-long lecture courses.

The Federal Center for Political Education (FCPE) is a higher federal agency, that is, an institution without legal capacity, subordinate to the Federal Minister of the Interior. The predecessor of this institution can be considered the Reich Office for Home Service founded in 1918, during the closing months of the First World War. It had been organized by the imperial government as a propaganda instrument within the country, for domestic as opposed to front line service. The agency survived in the Weimar Republic with a different task --to support the democratic form of government. It was dissolved in 1933 by the National Socialist regime and was re-established in 1952 as the Federal Center for Home Service. It has been known since 1963 as the Federal Center for Political Education. Its 1976 budget was 18,550,000 Marks, and in 1977 it is 19,350,000 Marks. The assignment of this office to the Federal Ministry of the Interior is justified, despite the responsibility of the states for cultural affairs, on the basis that the task of providing citizens with political information and encouraging their democratic participation in the political process is a necessary element in support of the constitutional order. The overall safeguarding of the constitutional order is the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior.

A board of directors, composed of members of Parliament, is designed to prevent

political partisanship in the work of FCPE; a five-member advisory council of specialists aids in the work of the board of directors. This group, of which three directors represent the three parties represented in Parliament, works as a team in running the agency. It is important to emphasize the fundamental distinction between tasks of the FCPE and the Federal Public Relations Office (Bundespresseamt). The latter provides the citizens with information concerning the activities of the government and also campaigns for public support for current political programs. This is not the case with the FCPE. For that group, political education may also be critical of government policies in order to encourage independent thinking by citizens. According to a statement by the Minister of the Interior, the FCPE has the task, "through measures of political education to awaken in the German people an understanding of the political process, to strengthen democratic consciousness and the readiness for political participation,"[2] thus applying the cognitive as well as the affective and the instrumental aspects of educational objectives.

The State Centers for Political Education are similarly structured. They are fully independent of the FCPE and subordinate to either the Governors or the Cultural Ministers of the various states. Their budget varies in direct proportion to the size of the state, and currently amounts to 4,800,000 Marks in North Rhine-Westphalia, while the small State Center in the Saarland has at its disposal only 95,000 Marks.

The so-called independent sponsors are independent of the government, but most are ideologically or politically oriented. The 24 most important of the sponsors have joined together in a working committee for political education. The bulk of their work is carried out in conferences, usually held in their own educational institutions, and typically lasting several days. These institutions are often hotel-like building complexes, located in the countryside, away from the big cities and traffic. These offer rooms for participants, sufficient conference halls, and opportunities for social life and relaxation for the varied programs that are held throughout the year.

The FCPE normally supports all such independently sponsored conferences on political education, in most cases with 50% coverage of the total cost. The autonomy of the organizations in establishing teaching goals remains undisturbed, although the FCPE sees to it that their teaching methods are up to date. Some of the conferences supported by the FCPA are observed by FCPE representatives. The expenditures of the FCPE for this area amount to nearly 5,000,000 Marks yearly (1976), out of which 2040 conferences with about 55,000 participants are supported.

This brief overview should add to the rapidly growing Correspondence Course Program. Social science courses constitute the bulk of these lecture courses presented through radio and television. The first television lecture course began in 1967 in Bavaria. Worth mentioning are, among others, the Quadriga Radio Lecture Course in Educational Sciences, in which political education plays a remarkable role, the DIFF-Correspondence Course in Social Sciences for teachers, and a radio lecture course, "Social Change."[3] Such cources are made up of programs that are broadcast over radio or television, and often simultaneously, and through extensive written material and direct study programs that frequently take place on weekends with tutors.[4] The foundation of the first correspondence university in the Federal Republic in Hagen expanded upon the educational opportunities in this area.

B. Political Education Development Since 1950

The current situation in the political education field is marked by uncertainty. The pendulum is apparently swinging away from the enthusiasm for emancipation through innovative curricula. New trends seem to be appearing in political education as well as

in other educational quarters.[5] What the future will bring is difficult to predict.

The investigation of the development of political education in the past 25 years which is best verified empirically is the study by Thomas Ellwein and Ralf Yoll, commissioned by the FCPE.[6] Out of 4,000 periodical articles that appeared in the years between 1948 and 1968, a random sample of 720 was selected; of this sample the frequencies of 350 central ideas and the relationships among them were investigated. As a result three essential didactical phases can be distinguished that are closely related to the political history of the Federal Republic, though naturally overlapping in the reality of education:

First Phase: 1948-1955/56. Reconstruction Phase. In education the community and partnership concepts clearly dominate. Emphasis is placed upon social relationships rather than political relationships as a reaction to the destruction of civic culture through National Socialism. Theodor Wilhelm is considered to be the founder and major representative of this view, having taken up, by the way, many of the ideas of John Dewey.

Second Phase: 1955/56-1966. In this decade a view predominates in which knowledge of state institutions and of the democratic process are held to be most important; insights and understanding based upon this concept are taught. Leading representatives of this school were Eduard Spranger and Theodor Litt, and their ideas represented basically a continuation of civics instruction of the Weimar period; critics attacked this position as "state metaphysics." It would be interesting to draw a comparison between this view and the learning objectives and contents of the American educational discipline of "government."

Third Phase: since 1969. "Criticism" and "conflict" become more and more prominent as key educational concepts. Although challenged, this view becomes accepted in the 1960's. The Hessian educators Rudolf Engelhardt, Kurt Gerhard Fischer and Wolfgang Hilligen are the most prominent supporters of this new concept. These concepts of educational goals correspond in practical politics to the phasing out of our "fair weather democracy," that is, the era of Konrad Adenauer. Neither the model of harmony of Miteinander-Füreinander (With One Another - For One Another) which was the title of a widely used social science textbook, nor the idealization of the German democratic system and the so-called "free market economy" had proven to be an adequate interpretation of political realities.

Fourth Phase: Since about 1975 however, a movement frequently referred to as "Tendenzwende" (turning point) has apparently been growing stronger in politics as well as in the educational field. In 1974, with the resignation of Willy Brandt, a general disillusionment with the highly industrialized mass society set in. This setback for progressive forces in politics corresponds to similar setbacks in the field of education. Above all, it has been recognized that critical ability cannot be the main goal of political socialization.

This swinging back and forth of pedagogical postulates and goals must be difficult for the outsider to understand, especially when he bears in mind that despite those phases since about 1950, the Federal Republic is to be considered politically an unusually stable country. To offer an explanation, I must relativize the notion of the exceptional situation of political education in Germany in contrast to other states, and I would like to propose two theses on this point:

1. The political-educational discussion in our country that is being conducted over the correct understanding of democracy reflects the continuing conflict between representative vs. direct democracy which has gone on since the Enlightenment: Montesquieu vs. Rousseau. Nowadays, this discussion of "democratization" is over whether democracy

should be merely a state political order or one that encompasses the collective society. Nearly all fundamental political issues can be referred to this antinomy.

2. This discussion is also carried on in other countries, even if it is more concealed and much less fundamental. The "New Social Studies" curriculum movement in the U.S. is an example of this dispute over the proper understanding of democracy and indeed of politics itself.[7]

With this background, it is now possible to evaluate and discuss a few adult curriculum projects.

C. Curricula for Adult Political Education

Apart from the correspondence courses mentioned above, adult education made use of the new methods of educational science relatively late; that is to say, the planning and development of the first curricula did not begin before 1973/74. Most of these projects are financially assisted by the FCPE so that the goals and procedures of this work are accessible before they have been published; out of a total of ten curricula, none has been terminated thus far (early 1977). A summary of the programs allows a fair perspective on the main topics relevant in adult political education at the present time:

Project	Commissioned by:
1. Co-determination in Business Firms and Political Education	Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (German Labor Unions Federation)
2. Nature, Position, and Function of The Family in Society	Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholisch-sozialer Bildungswerke (Social-Catholic Educational Association)
3. Educational Policy as the Subject of Political Education	Leiterkreis der Evangelischen Akademien in Deutschland (Leadership Conference of the Evangelical Academies in Germany)
4. Local Self-Administration as Policy	Friedrich Ebert Foundation
5. Basic and In-Service Training of Secretaries as an Example of an Integrated Vocational and Political Education	Deutscher Volkshochschulverband (German Association for Adult Education)
6. Economics and Society	Konrad Adenauer Foundation
7. Citizen Action Groups and Environmental Concerns	Friedrich Naumann Foundation (FNS)
8. Social Market Economy	Institut der Deutschen Wirtschaft (German Employers' Institution)
9. Security and Society	Deutscher Bundeswehrverband (German Armed Forces Association)
10. European Integration	Institute for European Policy

EXAMPLE I: "Nature, Position, and Function of the Family in Society"

This course has been almost fully completed. The sponsor, the AKSB, is the nation-wide association of educational centers sponsored by the Roman Catholic Church. However, it is not as homogeneous an organization as one might expect, due to differences between the various religious orders operating education centers. The AKSB commissioned a team of specialists to work out the curriculum.

1. Didactic Concept

The authors describe their "Curriculum Strategy," as they call it, in these words:

In contrast to some curriculum concepts, it is assumed here that there does not exist a strict and deducible relationship between the situation of the learner, the learning objectives and the content of the curriculum. Adult education is not only concerned with imparting of functional, utilitarian qualifications for dealing with given situations of life. Rather, it aims at enabling the individual to self-reflect, criticize and identify with norms and values. In addition, the educational content of socio-cultural adult education has its own structural nature, and thus does not permit the imparting of content-neutral qualifications through arbitrary selection of the medium to be used. From this premise proceeds the curriculum strategic dual character of the basic texts (discussed in part A which follows). They provide, at the same time, an Analysis of the life situation of the participant and an Analysis of the present level of research on the topics. While an analysis of the life situation suggests basic criteria for a taxonomy of qualifications, the "structure of the matter" derived from the subject-specific scientific analysis provides the relevance and selection criteria for the educational content.

The basic concept as well as the goals of the program furnish the general orientation and the relevance filter for both the didactic and the subject-specific analysis.

In a Learning Objective-Content-Matrix, the content structure derived from the basic analysis is related to a classification set of desirable behaviors. The coordination of categories of content and behavior produces a catalog of "qualifications" which are characterized as learning objectives on a general goal level. The underlying goal provides the relevance filter for the selection and interpretation of content and objectives.

In a further step, the Learning Objective-Content-Matrix becomes an articulation schema, that is, a chronological plan of action for course models. In this didactic micro planning, detailed content units are connected with concrete content-oriented learning objectives, and translated into a sequence of learning steps. The methods, media, etc., to be used are also suggested.

The two other curriculum-strategic steps of evaluation and revision which were part of the original planning have largely been dropped due to organizational, institutional and other factors.

2. The Curriculum

Based on this conceptual basis, the authors have compiled their materials amounting, at present, to about 800 pages of manuscript:

Part A. Basic Materials

About 400 pages provide the basic knowledge of the subject matter meant primarily as a guide for instructors. The topics are:

I. The Family in Comparative Culture (75 pages);
II. Social and Legal History of the European Family (70 pages);
III. Problems of the Modern Family (110 pages);
IV. Family Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany (130 pages).

Part B. Course Models

About 200 pages of text consist primarily of background information. The materials are not didactically structured. However, "commentary" interspersed in the text deals with didactic problems which might arise within the respective contexts, e.g., barriers to learning, questions of method.

Part C. Materials

This part makes up the final quarter of the curriculum: Statistics, tables, references to films, quotations and references to literature. They are related to the individual courses and are to be used as additional sources of information for the instructor and participants.

3. Learning Objectives

Considering the current state of the family in the society, the team of authors have formulated the following goal:

"To enable the family to recognize and analyze their position in society and, from the attitudes thus formed, to be able to function responsibly and adequately in public life, and, in so doing, to contribute to the democratization and humanization of society."

The team developed the following list of learning objectives:

List of Objectives

1.1 The ability to analyze the complex group structure of the family (i.e., the structures of relationships, roles, authority) and to reflect on one's own position in it.
1.2 The readiness to examine realistically what is expected in family assignment of roles, and to accept these roles.
1.3 The ability and readiness to recognize and to use not only one's own operational range within the family group structure and to recognize that this range might change.
1.4 To become sensitive to the feelings, emotions and needs of the other members of the family.

2.1 The ability to recognize the constants and variables of the family life form, as well as its structurally related opportunities and dangers within and outside of the culture in which we live.
2.2 The ability and readiness to question the basic assumptions of the given conditions of family life and to analyze and plan possible alternative solutions.
2.3 The readiness to support critically questioned or self-initiated alternative forms of common living.
2.4 The ability to reflect the social and individual suppositions and consequences of alternative forms of living and education and to examine responsibly opportunities for their actualization.

3.1 To recognize that development and change in forms of family life are to be seen in the context of the respective stages of economic and social development.
3.2 To learn that the usual family form is not determined by nature, but has arisen historically and is changeable.
3.3 The ability and readiness to recognize and use opportunities for change and development of existing family and educational forms.
3.4 The ability and readiness to consider the conditions and results of a change in the existing family structure and to assume responsibility for the consequences of one's own decisions.

4.1 The ability to analyze the non-negotiable functions of the family in society as well as the general conditions of social and governmental decision-making affecting the family.
4.2 The ability and readiness to not accept uncritically social and political influences and models, but to critically examine their underlying interests, norms and values.
4.3 The ability and readiness to recognize, use and expand the opportunities for increasing family influence upon social events and political decision-making.
4.4 The ability and readiness to recognize and affirm the responsibility of the family for a humanization of public life.

4. Problematic Aspects and Criticism

The overview I have presented was essentially based on the wording of the author team. In the following, I will now summarize this project so that the principal issues of this summary will serve as departure points for discussion.

The emphasis of the project is without a doubt based upon scientific findings as provided by sociology. This assertation is demonstrated by the range of the basic material in Part A and B. On the other hand, the didactic analysis of the needs of the target group has been neglected. Equating "analysis of the life situation" and "analysis of the scientific content" may not be very convincing: To use only one example, the family situation of the Nayar (in India) has absolutely nothing in common with that of the Central European family of the 20th century. (This is, by no means, to belittle the didactic value of "alienation" through such cross cultural comparisons.) The comprehensive

justification and legitimation of the envisaged goal reveals the preponderance of the particularly German humanistic-academic tradition of thinking. This supports the reproach of an over-emphasized scientific orientation at the expense of the underdeveloped didactic structure.

Despite this fundamental criticism, we wish to reaffirm the view that "a strict deductive relationship between situation, qualification and content does not exist." Logically, if we were to take learning objectives as absolute, it would make the selection of subject matter almost immaterial. This, however, was certainly not the intention of those who sought an "educational reform through a revision of the curriculum." Saul B. Robinsohn, to whom we are indebted for having opened the discussion of learning goals in our country, writes: "Among the many decisions to be made concerning the educational process, none is more important than that dealing with the 'What,' that is, the content, which in itself educates."[9] In the Federal Republic, it is becoming accepted that the educational content cannot be derived from the learning objectives, but must rather be planned with these goals in mind.[10]

A very questionable development --and not only in the eyes of American educators-- is the abandonment of the originally planned evaluation phase. Contrary to what was stated by the authors, however, there has been formative evaluation, but no summative evaluation. It is to be feared that such a procedure of development is not untypical for the Federal Republic. Numerous commissions, especially those without sufficient funds and time at their disposal, proceed on the basis of so-called "proven" subject matters, coat them with learning objectives and hope, thereby, to catch up with modern curriculum development. Other groups use highly refined and abstract conceptual models in originating learning objectives, but then leave the conversion and actualization for practical teaching largely up to the instructor and teacher.

EXAMPLE II: Television Project, "The Nineteenth Century"

The initiative for this project came from the department for "Educational Programs" in the North German Broadcasting Service (Norddeutscher Rundfunk - NDR). The Broadcasting Service turned to the FCPE for planning and financial help. The interest of our office consisted above all in influencing the broadcast series so that: a) a contribution to the political education of the viewers would be made, and b) a model for multi-media projects could be developed.

1. The Developmental Process

First phase: Working out the concept
Early 1971 -- First contact between the North German Broadcasting Service and the FCPE.
May 1971 -- First working conference of the FCPE and the Broadcasting Service with historians, sociologists, political scientists, psychologists and educators.
September 1971 -- Second working conference. Determination of goals, formation of a scientific advisory council (three historians, two history methodologists, one political scientist, one representative of the FCPE, and one representative of the Broadcasting Service). The Advisory Council carried out further work on planning.

Second Phase: Subject matter and didactic preparation
November 1971 -- Assignment of tasks to reputable historians for the preparation of twenty-six (26) half-hour broadcast drafts.
June 1972 -- Approval of the drafts by the Advisory Council, thereby concluding the preparation on the subject specific scientific level.
July 1972 -- The didactic specialists H.J. Rohlfes and H. Süssmuth arrange the very comprehensive broadcast drafts on the basis of didactic considerations and determine content emphasis.

Third Phase: Production
Early 1973 -- Four television journalists develop the TV adaptation. A few of the topics, such as the church, education, or the philosophy of the Nineteenth Century, prove to be too abstract for effective television use. They are simply dropped. Twenty topics remain for twenty broadcasts. Archive research begins.
Assignments are given out for the preparation of the manuscripts for the two film guide copies in the "Information for Political Education" series.
May 1974 - February 1976 -- Filming.
August 1975 -- A pilot film is produced for evaluation. It is shown to insiders as well as to adult education students and a few high school (ninth grade) classes. Their reactions are considered and worked into the production of the film scripts.
Mid 1975 -- Publication of the two film guide copies.
October 1975 -- Broadcast Premier.

2. Didactic Approach

On the basis of the commission meetings, the Advisory Council formulated the following goal for the entire project: "to counteract the widespread political apathy in the population and to make growth processes of social and political trends and conditions understandable in terms of present day conditions."

Even though this goal is not formulated in an operational manner, it can, I believe, be accepted without reservation, especially since measurable learning processes were, at first, not intended even though it was intended from the beginning to include the broadcasts in adult education programs. Political education, generally, will have to aim at objectives which defy easy measurement.

It should be noted that the series was planned for broadcast to the target group represented by the viewing audience of Channel Three, the West German regional television network. In the FRG, Channel Three broadcasts are oriented not so much to the tastes of the upper social strata, but rather to the "educated bourgeoisie." Thus, it would have been possible for producers to assume a certain level of basic knowledge and intellectual interest by the viewer. It should be possible to present it over any of the three television channels.

By describing the didactic considerations of the project (the main theme of the first phase), I would like to give an example to illustrate a concept which, in the United States, may seem rather questionable to educators: That educational content cannot be derived from learning objectives, but must be conceived with these objectives in mind.[11] The North German Broadcasting Service came to the FCPE with a topic proposal, didactically speaking, with an educational subject ("The Nineteenth Century"). We considered the theme in relationship to one of the general purposes of our own work, namely, to counteract political apathy, and we decided that we could further this goal by making use of the suggested content. A decision concerning the methodology to be used remained open for the time being as the fundamental didactic problem.

From the very beginning, specialists in the FCPE had reservations about whether the method of progressive presentation in history courses, especially popular in the schools, was in accord with our goal. A wide-ranging presentation of the events of the nineteenth century could have been related to the present-day situation only with difficulty, and the attempt of motivating a target group unfamiliar with traditional educational concepts would probably have failed. Nonetheless, historians in the commission at first supported this approach.

In 1970, the FCPE had commissioned Hans Süssmuth of the Pedagogical University (Pädagogische Hochschule) of the Rhineland at Neuss to work out a course under the working title "An Historical Approach to Contemporary Studies." His conception of historical learning was presented for discussion at a meeting of didactic specialists sponsored by the FCPE, and in 1972 it was published in the FCPE's publication series.[12] Süssmuth was

an original member of the commission responsible for the project on the "Nineteenth Century," and was also elected to its Advisory Council.

His approach can be introduced here only briefly. The scientific aspect of his concept is based on the structuralists of the Annales, a group of scholars affiliated with the French periodical Annales d'histoire économique et sociale. This circle seeks to replace the history of events with a "structural history." By overcoming historicism, the group seeks to establish patterns of "longue durée" to come to grips with the development processes of society. Thus, the emphasis of study is in the area of social history, and history itself is considered as a "science de l'homme," or as human science in the broadest sense.[13] This idea of including history in the social sciences finds its parallel expression in didactic theory where Süssmuth supports integration of all the social sciences into one subject area which ought to be called "Politik" or "Gesellschaftslehre," more or less corresponding to the social studies in America. In his approaches to learning theory, Süssmuth follows the concept of Jerome S. Bruner.[14]

This conception, which Hans Süssmuth calles the "structuring process," can only be mentioned in passing. An important aspect of this is the "regressive-diachronic" method, which means that the problem constellation is gained from contemporary issues and that the chronological sequence of events is abandoned. This method has proven suited to the project on "The Nineteenth Century."

From the technical point of view of filmmaking, giving up the principle of chronology needs to be compensated through a moderator who, by way of commentary and questions, points out the relevance and relationship to the present of the broadcast.

The didactic approach of the broadcasts made advisable the use of supplementary printed material which enables the viewer to systematize the historical material. Two issues of the Informationen zur politischen Bildung series, one of the most widely distributed materials put out by the Federal Office, were edited in order to arrange, supplement and put into context the information given in the TV films. Each chapter in the Informationen corresponds, as a rule, to one broadcast from the TV series.

3. Costs and Distribution

The Broadcasting Service covered the production costs. Altogether, the FCPE paid out 2,000,000 Marks for the research preparation, the licenses and for the production of 150 copies of the film for distribution, and also acquired the non-commercial broadcast rights. Over one million copies of the supplementary guide material (issues No. 163, 164 of the Informationen series) were printed. The total cost of the printed guide material ran about 1,000,000 Marks.

The series was first broadcast by the "Nordkette," a broadcasting group in North Germany and Berlin, followed by the West German, Hessian and South West Broadcasting Services, and Austrian Television participated as a co-producer. In the meantime, the films have been dubbed in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Arabic for broadcast in the "Third World."

D. Conclusion

Several areas in which political education does occur had to be omitted in this paper: the army, for instance, is obligated by law to teach civics to young soldiers; other target groups are high school and college students and unemployed youths. It was my intent to give a certain perspective on some German projects of political education and the development procedure which might be considered as typical for our country. Let me conclude by describing some of the difficulties in cross-national understanding.

I was asked and I agreed to speak about "programs" of adult education. The first association of a European in this connection will be that of "programmed learning," because, rightly or not, Americans are suspected to represent a rather rationalistic, behavioristic approach to teaching. Nevertheless, I decided not to confine myself to present curricula but additionally to give some background information about the context, scope and structure of political education in the FRG. It was only when I asked an American educationalist that I learned that a program might be called any kind of teaching activity. If I had known this before, my paper might have become somewhat different. Similar misunderstandings may be aroused by the word "evaluation." When germanized into "Evaluation," this mere testing of material turns out to be a comprehensive, highly sophisticated process with the use of all imaginable methods of social and educational science ...

I am not apologizing. It is my view that much more and more intensified international cooperation is essential for improved mutual understanding of education contexts and processes.

References

1. Deutscher Bildungsrat. Empfehlungen der Bildungskommission, Strukturplan für das Bildungswesen. Bonn, 1970, p. 198.

1a. On this subject, see also: Vieregge, H. v. "Zur politischen Bildungsarbeit der parteinahen Stiftungen," in Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, supplement to the weekly Das Parlament. B7/1977.

2. Founding statement issued on 10 September 1969.

3. Klafki, W., etc. Funk-Kolleg Erziehungswissenschaft. 3 vols. Frankfurt, 1970; Hilligen, W. "Report on the Distance Studies Course 'Social Studies,'" in German Studies Notes. Published by the Institute of German Studies, Bloomington 1976; Funkkolleg Sozialer Wandel. 12 vols. Tübingen, 1974. Published by the Deutsches Institut für Fernstudien an der Universität Tübingen.

4. See, e.g., the detailed description of one program by Wolfgang Hilligen, Report on the Distance Studies Course "Social Studies". German Studies Notes, Bloomington, Indiana, 1976.

5. Examples: Brüggeman, W. Bildung oder Indoktrination? Recklinghausen, 1974; Gutjahr-Löser, P. and H.H. Knütter, eds. Der Streit um die politische Bildung. Munich, 1975.

6. Ellwein, Th. and R. Zoll. "Politische Bildung und empirische Sozialforschung." Materialien zur politischen Bildung. 1/1973, p. 34.

7. One of the goals of curriculum developers of the New Social Studies was to introduce a more critical and less affirming form of political education. Patrick, S.J. "Schwerpunkte des politischen Unterrichts in der Sekundarstufe" in: Politische Bildung in den Vereinigten Staaten. Verfahren der Curriculumentwicklung. Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Heft 115. Bonn, 1977, p. 37 ff.

8. From the "Tätigkeitsbericht" (Annual Report) of the Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. 1976.

9. Robinsohn, S.B. Bildungsreform als Revision des Curriculum. Neuwied, 1972, p. 4.

10. Rohlfes, J. "Curriculumentwicklung und Lernzielermittlung" in: Geschichtsunterricht, Inhalte und Ziele, Beiheft zu Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht. 1974, p. 9. Schmidt-Sinns, D. Umweltschutz als fachübergreifendes Curriculum. Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Heft 99. Bonn, 1974, p. 8.

11. Compare p. 7.

12. Süssmuth, Hans. "Lernziele und Curriculumelemente eines Geschichtsunterrichts nach strukturierendem Verfahren." in: Lernziele und Stoffauswahl im politischen Unterricht. Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Heft 93. Bonn, 1972.

13. Extensive literature in Süssmuth, op. cit. See also: Levi-Strauss, C. Anthropologie Structurale. Paris, 1958; German translation: Strukturale Anthropologie. Frankfurt, 1971; Meier, Ch. "Was soll uns heute noch die Alte Geschichte," in: Meier, Entstehung des Begriffs Demokratie. Frankfurt, 1970. For a critical discussion of the structuralists: Groh, D. Kritische Geschichtswissenschaft in emanzipatorischer Absicht. Stuttgart, 1973. See also: Heft 96 and 102, Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

14. Bruner, J.S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass., 1960. On the discussion of the didactics of history in the USA, see: Wesley, E.B. "Let's Abolish History Courses." in: Phi Delta Kappa LIX/1967, p. 3.

ADULT POLITICAL EDUCATION IN THE ANTI-POLITICAL SYSTEM

Edward Schwartz

As I understand my assignment, I am to provide an overview of adult political education in the United States. I could approach this task in a number of ways. One would be to provide an overview of the variety of programs that have arisen over the years to respond to the civic and political needs of adults. In a few cases, university extension programs have served as sponsors of such courses. In most, civic organizations--churches, labor unions, citizen action groups like the League of Women Voters or the Y's--have offered them. In the past few years, the National Endowment for the Humanities has stimulated many of them through its state-based public committees for the humanities, which regrant funds to groups that want to conduct citizen forums bringing people and humanists together. Thus, in this presentation, I would merely gaze over the landscape of adult political education, and give you a guided tour of highlights as seen from above.

A second way to handle the problem would be to concentrate on the administrative and financial difficulties experienced by specific adult citizen education programs. Such a presentation, I imagine, would be of great interest to groups like the Adult Education Association and its local affiliates. In it, I would address such questions as, "How can we establish the legitimacy of adult citizen education within formal educational institutions?" or, "Who should sponsor adult citizen education--the schools or the civic groups?" Or, "Will government support for adult education lead to government control?" Most practitioners--and I am one--would assure you that these are burning questions, the topic of most of our conversations as we pursue our work. Whether the flames would appear as bright in an analytical session such as this, aimed primarily at political scientists and university educators, however, is problematic.

A third possibility would be to consider the slow development of adult citizen education as a field, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the profession as a whole. Here, I would examine the similarities and differences among the various adult political education programs; identify the common approaches used by institutions that maintain little connection with one another; and pinpoint national developments that are contributing to the process of consolidation within the field--the movement for "life-long" learning, for example, or the National Endowment's state-based programs. Here again, however, I fear that I would be dwelling on matters of greater interest to a few professionals than to those who want to know how adult political education relates to broader issues of politics and education in the country.

Thus, I will avoid the temptation merely to deliver the first annual report of the Alliance for Adult Education--an important sub-committee of the Alliance for Citizen Education that Howard Mehlinger and I are trying to organize--and attempt, rather to relate the rise of adult political education in the United States to economic and social crises that the country is now experiencing. Why, after all, should we even need formal educational programs raising political issues, or teaching the techniques of political action, to adults? Surely, these are skills that citizens ought to have acquired by the time they leave high school, not to mention college. Why, then, isn't adult political education considered a remedial field, comparable to literacy programs, consumer education programs, and vocational training programs offered through the poverty program or Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

What are the political conditions that have given rise to adult political education? Even assuming that many American young people receive inadequate civic training in high school and college, couldn't they be expected to pick up enough knowledge on their own to handle the basic political choices they must make? Years ago, George Washington Plunkitt

commented that a candidate had to unlearn a college education before he could be effective at winning votes in urban politics. What has happened to our political system that people now feel the need to return to classrooms before gaining enough confidence to participate?

These are questions that we must ask in order to place the rise of adult political education in proper perspective. It is only through an analysis of the political system that we can fully understand the goals of the new programs in adult education, the similarities and differences among the social studies courses offered in the schools. We need not examine every individual program to get a sense of what they do. They share a surprising range of assumptions, even when they deal with different ideologies and issues. A fraternity seems to be developing among the disgruntled and the disaffected among us, and it is leading to a revival of populist sentiments that cut across old ideological divisions. It is this populism, I would suggest, that has prompted a revival of adult political education, and given a common shape to its various forms.

Therefore, having told you what I will not do here, let me turn to my main thesis. It is one that will probably alarm some of you--although fewer now than ten years ago when leaders of the student Left first advanced it in the universities. I can state it in one line: the demand for political education has arisen as confidence in the anti-political system has declined. By the "anti-political system," I mean the network of large corporations that controls most of the wealth in the country, that employs a large percentage of our people, and that has emerged, in Peter Drucker's words, as the nation's "representative" institutions. I define this system as anti-political on several grounds; it disparages politics and tries to insulate itself against governmental control; it elevates individual achievement in the quest for wealth and power above the collective effort of communities to determine their common destinies; and it refuses to acknowledge that the historic ideals of civic equality, democratic participation and substantive justice should even be standards for its behavior. Yet it is this anti-political system that decides most important matters for us--where we work, where we live, even how we live--and competes with political parties, voluntary organizations and government itself for our allegiance and support.

Why, however, do I say that the breakdown of the anti-political system has given rise to the demand for political education, instead of attributing this demand to a breakdown in government? After all, even before the Kennedy administration and the upheavals that followed, E. E. Schattschneider labelled us a "semi-sovereign people" with the "largest elected oligarchy in the world," in which more than 40 million people--40% at the time--failed to show up at the polls on election day.[1] Pluralists like Seymour Martin Lipset, Daniel Bell, and Robert Dahl never disputed these statistics--how could they? They merely rationalized that as long as representatives, working through interest groups, could come to acceptable compromises through the "rules of the game," then the system was being responsive. Indeed, in Political Man, Professor Lipset even suggested that non-participation reflected broad satisfaction with the system, despite evidence that the non-voters tended to be poor, black and uneducated--with little reason to feel satisfied. Nonetheless, everyone agreed that our political institutions had failed to involve large sections of the populace; they merely disagreed as to whether the situation was cause for rejoice or alarm.

Yet, if government was not the main source of authority in this pluralist universe, then it was the anti-political system that had to carry the burden. Both Weber and Durkheim had predicted that this would happen in modern society--that corporate, rationalized structures would mold the rest. Their words proved prophetic. As long as the Gross National Product grew and the average citizen's standard of living rose over time then the majority of the people were willing to put up with unresponsive government

or at least not to resist it. Indeed, the economic goals of corporations became the standard by which people judged the success or failure of government. As John Kenneth Galbraith observed in 1967 in The New Industrial State:

> Members of the technostructure, we have seen, identify themselves with its goals because they find these goals superior to their own and because there is a chance of adapting them to their own. The relationship of the technostructure of the mature corporation to the state is the same. The state is strongly concerned with the stability of the economy. And with its expansion or growth. And with education. And with technical and scientific advance. And, most notably with the national defense. These are the national goals: they are sufficiently trite so that one has a reassuring sense of the obvious in articulating them. All have their counterpart in the needs and the goals of the technostructure. It requires stability in demands for its planning. Growth brings promotion and prestige. It requires trained manpower. It needs government underwriting of research and development. Military and other technical procurement support its most developed form of planning. At each point the government has goals with which the technoctrusture can identify itself. Or, plausibly, these goals reflect adaption of public goals to the goals of the technostructure.[2]

Even a Kennedy or a Johnson could not or would not be much better than this "technostructure" required; and the voters demonstrated on more than one occasion that even when the price of "stimulating the economy" and "creating jobs" was a regressive tax system which put the entire burden of social programs and military expenditure upon them, they were willing to pay it.

Today, of course, most Americans do not share this faith in an abundant future, brought to us courtesy of General Motors and General Foods. We need not dwell on the events and movements that eroded it--the Civil Rights Movement, that challenged whether the wealth was "trickling down" to the bottom; the youth movement, that questioned whether it was offering genuine satisfaction and meaning to people at the top; the environmental movement, that imposed standards of ecology upon corporate use of the land; the consumer movement, that raised questions of health and safety about corporate behavior in the marketplace; and, importantly, the economy itself, that has produced declining real incomes for working people in every quarter since 1965. The important point is that the cumulative effect of all these movements has been to shatter the authority of the anti-political system decisively. Business leaders are now near the bottom of the public esteem scale, while consumer advocates are at the top. Now, even those who expected miracles from industry, technology, and cybernetics are turning to government for leadership and direction. For all the talk about the evils of the federal bureaucracy, it was Jimmy Carter's promise of "effective, competent government" that carried the day, not Gerald Ford's commitment to little government. Thus, the conclusion is inescapable: the demand for political education has grown in response to the breakdown of the anti-political system.

There is a second aspect to the problem, however. While citizens may want government to lead, they equally want it to listen. Indeed, the polls suggest that the public is angry at their politicians not for trying to do too much, but for kowtowing to a few "special interests" at the expense of the rest. The new demand for "power"--black and student power, ethnic and women power--reflects a desire to take part in the decisions that affect us, particularly since these decisions shape greater and greater areas of our lives.

Yet where can the average citizen acquire the requisite training to be able to influence government effectively? Certainly not in schools designed to meet the requirements of the anti-political system--that is, to produce skilled, but obedient, technicians and bureaucrats. Recent studies suggest that the school is not even a good place to acquire knowledge about politics. The New York Times recently reported on a study of 13 to 17 year olds undertaken by the National Assessment of Educational Programs that revealed that more than half of the 17 year olds could not correctly answer a question

that required an understanding of the Fifth Amendment's protection against required self-incrimination, and that one out of every eight students believed that the President is not required to obey the law.[3]

In the area of cultivating political skills, the record of the schools is even more bleak. Nowhere is the impact of the anti-political system more apparent. Where political education would cultivate the ability of people to reach common decisions through debate and dialectic, the schools emphasize a corporate standard of "rationality" that almost precludes serious conflict between differing points of view. Where democratic processes would promote discussion and argument as the best way to arrive at a common standard of justice, the schools--like the corporations--promote silence in the name of efficiency. Equality would be the ethic of any decent program of political education; hierarchy is what the schools offer to prepare students for the major bureaucracies. The ability to mobilize, to organize, to confront unresponsive institutions would be the mark of a good student of politics, but since such a mark would be a black mark on the employment line, the schools scrupulously avoid trying to make it.

So citizens face a double dilemma. They expected the corporate system to offer the major rewards of our society--jobs, income, security--only to discover that government action is needed to bring equity to the process. They attended school to learn how to adjust to the anti-political system--to get a job, to become a consumer--only to learn later that they also need political skills to influence the major decisions that affect them. It is this situation which generates the need for political education for adults. At this point, citizens must try to acquire political skills and aptitudes that they never thought they would need, because they were always told that they wouldn't.

If the breakdown of the anti-political system has put individual citizens in an impossible position, it has been no less a problem for major interest groups. Lobbies like the AFL-CIO and the NAACP might have remained credible had the economy itself continued to respond to the basic needs of their members. Yet a strategy that called for seeking incremental improvements through collective bargaining, court decisions, and social welfare programs could not survive in a world where major movements were demanding a fundamental restructuring of American institutions, while, alternatively, multinational corporations were consolidating their power over our basic resources. We are all familiar with what happened when minorities and students gave up on working "within the system." Today, the parallel response of the middle class to unemployment, inflation, and continuing economic crisis has been even worse--sullen withdrawal from political life. Apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness have replaced riots, rebellions, and violent revolutionaries as the three most serious diseases afflicting the American polity today, and virtually every major institution is struggling for a way to remedy them.

Complaints about apathy are the most widespread among citizen organizations. Every group--whether it be a church social organization, or a neighborhood association, or a union local, or a political action movement--complains about apathy. How can they build loyalty among the mass of their members? How can they find people to do the work of the organization? Even when leaders know well how unhappy their friends and neighbors are about the state of the nation, they will still blame most of their problems on apathy. Indeed, I would suggest that it is really another version of "blaming the victim," whereby citizens flagellate themselves for situations that the anti-political system has created. Can we condemn people who grew up learning that the economic order would meet their needs--all they had to do was get a job--for not knowing how to respond to the betrayal of this promise? Yet to the leaders of most of the country's interest groups, it is nothing more than apathy that stands in the way of a massive citizen revolt.

Selfishness is a second anti-political value that gets in the way of political commitment. In the public forums that the Institute for the Study of Civic Values has sponsored in Philadelphia over the past three years, there has hardly been a meeting in which somebody doesn't denounce the competitiveness of the country, the "every man for himself" atmosphere of all institutions, the scramble for the "Almighty dollar." Workers complain now not only about their managers, but about their co-workers. Neighborhood residents are fed up not only with city hall, but with the people on their blocks who won't keep their kids off the streets late at night. Politically active citizens have had it with the "wheeling and dealing" associated with conventional politics, to the point that all issues now quickly escalate to a level of high moral crisis, if not discourse. Every poll in the past three years attested to the deep longing of the public for a renewed respect for common civic and moral values; and, of course, President Carter built his campaign almost entirely around this theme. Yet, needless to say, the problem hasn't vanished with the Carter Presidency.

The third, and perhaps most pervasive complaint, is that of powerlessness. In 1963, it was only radical students at Port Huron who were prepared to talk about gaining "power over the decisions that affect our lives." Then it became black people, and other minorities, and women. Now it is everyone--young workers, ethnics, urban neighborhood activists, taxpayers, farmers--everyone feels a loss of power. To be sure, some will say that if people just weren't so apathetic and selfish, then they could all get together and regain the power that corporations have taken from them, but this is not the only position. A substantial majority--as high as 60%--will now respond affirmatively on political alienation questionnaires to the proposition that "People like me don't have much to say at all about what the government does."

It is the effort to combat these privatized responses to the anti-political system--apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness--that pushes citizen groups and activists to develop new programs in adult citizen education. They understand that conveying knowledge about the issues is necessary to the process, but insufficient. They are aware that even reviewing how the political system operates will not matter, as long as their members feel that they can do little to change it. Fundamentally, the new adult programs are aiming at changing political behavior--changing observors into members, changing mere members into active participants. All the programs share this goal of expanding participation. They differ only as to which of the three anti-political values that they most try to combat. To the unions, apathy is the major enemy; to churches, it is selfishness; to a growing network of centers for training community organizers, it is powerlessness. Yet even a cursory glance at these varied undertakings suggests that building involvement is the theme of all of them.

In the unions' case, week-long, intensive training sessions or institutes are the vehicle for training. Most major labor organizations sponsor such programs every summer, generally at state universities like Rutgers, Penn State, or Cornell with departments in worker education. They vary little from union to union. Participants receive intensive instruction in the union contract, in grievance procedures, and in principles of collective bargaining. They also learn the union's stands on the major political issues and hear arguments from prominent union officials in support of them. Usually, politicians sympathetic to the union make appearances. Thus, by the end of the week, those in attendance, who include business agents, shop stewards, and promising newcomers, can return to their factories imbued with a sense of the organization's mission and armed with a set of arguments and tactics to transmit this feeling to the other members.

And herein lies the not-so-hidden agenda of the summer institutes. It is a powerful device for reinforcing commitment to the union from the participants, and for showing them how to combat the apathy of the members. Labor organizations may be compulsary in

most states, but active involvement in them is not. Yet participation is essential to a union if it is to succeed in collective bargaining and in its political objectives. To encourage this sort of commitment, the organizations will make sure that its officers are fully knowledgeable about the union's benefits; that they can relate to the members in terms that they can understand; and they understand the connection between "solidarity forever" and better hours and working conditions from the company. The United Auto Workers has the most elaborate program to accomplish all of this, including a two-week retreat at a beautiful conference center in Black Lake, Michigan, where all participants go through a mock union convention. Not surprisingly, the U.A.W. has remained a strong union during the harshest periods for the automobile industry. They simply won't accept apathy as an immutable law of human nature.

To the churches, the major problems have been selfishness and greed. In the past five years, since the burial of the anti-war movement, there has been real soul-searching on the part of all denominations on how to relate their religious mission to the social and political concerns of the people. For the Catholic Church, the response has been to turn to the ethnic neighborhoods where their parishes are located in order to support community education and organization that will preserve the neighborhoods' vitality and power. It is safe to say that the Church, through its Campaign for Human Development and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, is the main source of organizing money in the United States today.

Yet a parallel debate is taking place within Protestant denominations as well. Edward Powers of the United Church of Christ, for example, produced something called The Shalom Curriculum a few years ago, designed as a moral and civic education program for its congregants. The National Council of Churches, in turn, cooperated with the People's Bicentennial Commission last year to produce a study guide for discussion groups on America's revolutionary heritage and values called The Light and the Steeple. Within the Jewish community, finally, there is a renewed discussion of the synagogue's relationship to the surrounding Jewish community, beyond its current involvement in Israel and the plight of Soviet Jews. What is important here is not merely that churches and synagogues are trying to respond to the problems of individualism and acquisitiveness in modern life. That is what they are supposed to do. The interesting point for our purposes is that they have chosen to initiate a range of formal programs, even courses, in moral and citizen education for adults as a vehicle to bring these concerns from the pulpit back into the communities where people are raising them.

Finally, in the area of combatting powerlessness, we come to the most dramatic new development in the area of adult citizen education --the growth of several training centers for community organizing. Saul Alinsky's Industrial Area Foundation in Chicago stood almost alone in this field for 20 years. Today, the I.A.F. has stiff competition. In Chicago itself, a group called the National Training Center runs week-long crash courses in how to gain power in local neighborhoods, at the same time as it supports a national network of groups called National People's Action that has led important fights against "redlining" by banks and for federal community development programs responsive to neighborhoods. Also in Chicago is Heather Booth's Midwest Academy, with ties to the labor and political movements, as well as connections with community organizations that see themselves as pursuing the values of the movements of the 1960's. The Martin Luther King Center in Atlanta has emerged as a major source for training in non-violence and citizen action for the entire South; while the New England Training Center is serving a similar role in New England. These are just a few examples, but they are extremely important. The movement of neighborhoods has been activated only in the past four years,

but it is certain to grow. One critical reason is the number of training centers whose whole purpose is to provide organizers to make them grow.

Thus, through unions, churches, and community organizing centers, a growing number of citizens are learning how to combat the ills of apathy, greed, and powerlessness that have arisen in the anti-political system. You will notice that I have said nothing at all about the role of formal educational institutions - universities, colleges, and high schools - in the process. That is because at this time they are playing no role in it. All the innovation is taking place outside of the institutions whose purpose is education. There may be justification for this somewhere but I doubt it. Ideally, an educational institution ought to be a center for all kinds of learning in a community, and especially for the kind of education that we have been discussing. Citizen education is not some recent invention of the radical Left. It has deep roots in the Athens of 4th Century B.C. and in Jefferson's vision of an educated populace in this country. If modern colleges and universities no longer take these concerns seriously, it is they who are betraying tradition, not the activists.

Yet, there is little question that to offer substantive assistance to the new programs in adult political education that <u>are</u> developing, higher education and secondary education would have to redefine the kind of knowledge that it now takes seriously. It would have to recognize that its current emphasis on "value-free" scholarship, on "rational" techniques, on hierarchy, and on neutrality may reflect the imperatives of a modern, anti-political system, but not an educational theology emblazoned in bronze for all time. There have been other equally valid notions of what a university might consider to be knowledge, all thoroughly consistent with political education. I have alluled to some of these in passing, but it would be useful to pinpoint them more directly here.

First, to become responsive to political education, higher education and high schools would have to respect the process of learning about values. To be sure, academia promotes certain values now -- "objectivity," tolerance, due process, merit. Yet it projects itself as value-free. To assist civic education, these institutions would themselves have to adhere to the covenants of America's civil religion. They would not be ashamed or embarrassed to promote commitment to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the Constitution, even while encouraging the widest possible debate on how they might be applied. As every activist knows, there can be no common action without shared values. Thus, the university would have to admit that it shares certain values with the country as well and that one of its goals is to help students come to grips with them.

Second, the university would have to learn how to relate the issues of modern society - employment, energy, corporate power, peace - to the broad values that it was examining. Under the anti-political system, every consideration is removed from private and public decision making but the narrowest questions of profit and loss. Issues of equity, ecology, reciprocity, even honesty and morality are reduced to "impact statements" to be designed by a planner and tested through a computer. Whatever the requirements modern citizenship might create, learning how to become a computer programmer should not be among them. Indeed, it should be the educator's responsibility to help people relate their concerns to their commitments, not the citizen's job to figure out what abstruse statistical data mean in every case. Figuring out the appropriate techniques for these analyses, then, should be an important responsibility of any institution that wants to

take adult political education seriously.

Ultimately, however, the university that wanted to provide the kind of political education that adults need most would have to take the goal of civic participation seriously in itself. They could not be content to impart a few political facts and think that they were education for politics, or even leaving open the "option" of participation to those who wanted to take advantage of it. Theirs would have to be the ethic of Pericles --"we do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all." Indeed, the major criticism of the anti-political system on the part of activists is that it does not take this standard seriously. For the university to be of service, then, it would have to rethink its position on participation, and reestablish its connection to our democratic heritage, rather than to the corporate ideologies that have undermined it.

Thus, we can summarize the state of adult citizen education as follows: it has arisen in response to the breakdown of the anti-political system, at a time when people lack both the political knowledge and skill to make government work again. Where anti-politics promoted individualism, privatism, hierarchy, and obedience, it aims at promoting cooperation, equality, and participation. The skills it cultivates are those that will help people combat apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness in relationships to government and other major institutions in society. The institutions that support are those that themselves feel some moral stake within society - unions, churches, community organizations and centers. The formal educational institutions largely have ignored it - or, at best, given it secondary support. Yet the movement has continued to grow. To be sure, this is not the first time that the demand for political education has arisen in response to the corruption of a regime. Plato called for it as a way of building Athens in the 4th Century B.C.; St. Augustine saw it as the salvation of Rome; Rousseau prescribed it for 18th Century France. Yet these teachers were not really heard by the people of their times - at least not by enough to make a difference - and the empires that they condemned suffered the fate that they predicted for them.

The irony today, however, is that it is the people who are demanding political education, in much the same spirit as Plato, St. Augustine, and Rousseau. We will have to wait and see whether their teachers will catch up with them.

Footnotes

1. E.E. Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), p. 90.
2. John Kenneth Galbraith, The New Industrial State, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1967), p. 309.
3. New York Times, January 2, 1977, p. 1.

STUDY GROUP: POLITICAL EDUCATION

April 14, 1977

Organizer: Howard Mehlinger, Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University

Presiding: Shirley H. Engle, School Administration, Indiana University

Respondents: Lee F. Anderson, Economics and Political Science, Northwestern University; Charles R. Foster, U.S. Office of Education and Conference Group on German Politics.

Discussants: Barry Byron, Foreign Languages, Illinois College; Byron Massialas, Education, Florida State University; Dieter Schmidt-Sinns, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Bonn (FRG); Edward Schwartz, Institute for the Study of Civic Values, Philadelphia; William O. Stanley, Education, University of Illinois; Karlwilhelm Stratmann, Institut für Pädagogik, Ruhr-Universitäat Bochum (FRG).

Engle: Thank you, Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Schmidt-Sinns, for these fine papers. We will now hear statements from the two respondents and then have a period for questions and comments.

Anderson: Both speakers documented the fact that there is a growing interest in adult political education in the United States and Germany, and we can suspect that this is the case in the industrial world generally and, perhaps beyond that, on the entire globe. Ed Schwartz specifically addressed himself to the question of what is at the root of this as - what is causing this renaissance of interest in adult political education. He argues that it has risen in response to the breakdown of the anti-political system at the same time when people lack both political knowledge and skills to make government work again.

I have no quarrel with this kind of thesis, as far as it goes. I am just increasingly bothered as to whether or not this kind of analysis does go far enough to get at to what, in fact are the root causes of the problem. I think that if we look at adult political education from a larger perspective, we can see it as simply a part of a larger adult education movement. There is virtually no aspect of human life into which adult education is not moving, from sewing, to cooking, to pottery making, to automobile repairs. Is there some kind of generic, underlying phenomena that is common to a renaissance of interest in adult education, whether it be in automobile mechanics or political education? And the answer to that, I think, is: Yes, there is. This in turn raises the question of whether or not a restoration of traditional American values or, I would argue, traditional Western values, is in fact a solution to the problem that we confront. Or are we trapped in a far deeper crisis for which there is no known solution?

I would argue the larger phenomenon that is generating growing concern for adult education across a number of sectors is at once very simple and very profound. It's a geometrical increase in the complexity of culture. The linguistic environments, the technological environments, the institutional environments, the ideological environments that surround us - that condition us - are increasing in complexity at a geometrical rate.

Our education is probably improving, including our political education. My hunch is that if we had good measures, for example, we would find that the political literacy of the American public or the German public is substantially greater in the late 20th century than it was in the late 19th century. So, the quality of education is probably improving. But what is happening, I would argue, is that while the complexity of culture is increasing geometrically, the enhanced quality of education, including political education, is only increasing arithmetically. Thus, there is a growing gap between the complexity of the cultural environment, that we must somehow manage, and the quality of the education that gives us the competencies, or fails to give us the competencies, to manage this environment.

I think this is evidenced in a lot of ways, as you and I were pointedly reminded these last couple of days when we completed our income tax. There is a tremendous increase in the complexity of one piece of our linguistic environment - the tax form. I saw an article in the Chicago Tribune that gave me a bit of history about cultural complexity. The first tax form, I found out, was reprintable in its entirety, including all instructions, on the first page of the old New York Herald. Indeed, it didn't even consume the entire front page. Well, those of you who have just gone through your income tax forms know that there has been an enormous increase in the complexity of that bit of language. One must somehow try to master and manage it in order not to be cheated by the government. Like many people, I did not for a long time have those skills. But I must have them in order to be an effective tax fighter and hence avoid the inequities that are created in effect by ignorance on my part and knowledge on the part of corporate law experts when they file their tax returns.

If this kind of anthropological analysis is correct, then to talk about the causes of the crisis in political education in political terms is correct but also inadequate. The question that comes to my mind is, if this is the true character of the situation, whether or not some effort to return to tradition, to return to the values that Ed Schwartz spoke of as being embodied in our political religion - will be an effective course of action, whether or not we can operationalize, institutionalize the Constitution and Declaration of Independence in some kind of new form through adult education programs or improved civic education programs in the schools, I just don't know.

I have a good colleague at Northwestern, Francis Chou, who's a Sinophile, and hence sees everything good in China and very little good in the Western World. But Francis makes an argument that goes something like this: The crisis about which Ed Schwartz spoke in terms of apathy, in terms of increased powerlessness, increased in terms of a sense of selfishness or the lack of public mindedness on the part of many of us in our civic life, really is the product of the elaboration of the value of individualism that characterizes all of Western Civilization. It is manifested in the story of Noah, and the Iliad and all of the great literature of the Western World. As long as that in fact is the base value around which much of Western culture is constructed, we simply do not have any choice but to proceed on the road that we are going. That road leads to disaster. That road, of course, is part of the problem of which Ed Schwartz spoke. There is no question that we do have a tremendous decline in what many people call the civic order. Our response to that, from the level of the family to the society as a whole, is to make increasing demands upon the political order. The net result is, of course, that smart criminals (and I use that term broadly) can always outguess the new political demands. Students in school soon find new ways to outsmart the new security guards, which in turn prompt school boards to put new lock systems on which in turn prompt smart student in turn to find still new ways to unlock the new security locks and so on: the cycle is endless. The result, among other things, is increased inflation. We are paying for the increasing cost of the inefficiency of political solutions to problems that are fundamentally not solvable politically.

The question I leave with is this: If indeed the generic root of our problem is somehow found in an escalating complexity in the cultural environment that, somehow, individuals have to manage - and most of us cannot manage - in an effective and let alone a responsible way, whether or not we do ourselves a service, in the long run to base adult political education programs on the side of traditional values, or whether or not we may indeed be caught in a more profound crisis for which the Western World, to which we naturally turn, has really no solution. Perhaps there are suggestions elsewhere in the world that we might attend to. Perhaps we simply have to wait with serenity for God or history to, in

effect, reveal a new truth. In the meantime, I certainly have no quarrel with our speakers' work. Indeed, support it. But in the back of my mind there is always that nagging doubt: Are we really just treating symptoms, when in fact the cause is much, much deeper?

Foster: Lee Anderson has correctly made the point: both papers indicate that we must go beyond the school into the totality of the educational process in order to understand political education. In this country, perhaps even more than in Germany, there is an almost total isolation between the school and these various adult groups that engage in political education. We are just beginning to set up some linkages to try to overcome this kind of isolation. I would plead, since I am basically a school person, that even within the school we can do a lot more in dealing with the teachers who are really the adults in the school, so that we would politicize the whole school.

Many years ago in Glenn Falls, N.Y., there was an attempt made to internationalize the Glenn Falls school system whereby people worked on VW's and Toyotas rather than Chevrolets in the shop, and every aspect of the curriculum had some kind of international input. Well, I would plead very strongly that every aspect of the curriculum and every school in the U.S. have some kind of a political input, so that when a teacher is talking about the environment or talking about biology, he or she also understands that it is no use to talk about the environment, or produce solutions, or discuss it with students, without understanding that all of these areas have some kind of a political aspect.

All of the areas in which the students are involved - in decision making, in rules, in traditions within the school - have political implications and political aspects. I think one of the great values of the Torney book is that you cannot teach democracy in a school which is authoritarian and which has very bad structure. So, I would say, you cannot really teach civic education or political education in a school where in only one classroom the teacher does have any kind of a sense that politics is part of the curriculum. Therefore, my first point is that not only in adult education but also in the schools we must have more politicization.

Now, turning specifically to the German paper, I think that in Germany, more than in perhaps other industrialized countries, adult education has come to a sort of full flowering. There has always been a tradition in Germany, of doing much in adult education. My only question is: To what extent is the adult education linked with the previous educational process, and to what extent is it really truly political education? I also have some doubts about governmental agencies pushing that kind of adult educational process because, I think, it has to come out of the political culture itself, which is what is happening in Germany. Elsewhere, I've talked about the relationship of political culture to political education, but nowhere is it more evident than in Germany where you have a remade political culture.

Let me just quote you one statistic from the latest report of the Allensbach Public Opinion Institute. It's a book published in the Yearbook of Demography in Germany. Here is an interesting sideline to the kind of remade political culture which is behind the kind of adult education in Germany now. In 1959, 44% of the population were in voluntary organizations and only 77% of them were active. In the U.S., according to the Michigan Survey of 1960, 26% of the population were actively participating in such organizations, compared to the 7% in Germany. In 1975, according to this yearbook, 59% of the population were members of some kind of a voluntary organization in Germany and 17% of them were active. That is, they actually participated, held office, or did things. In the U.S. that figure has roughly stayed stable at about 24%. This indicates that in Germany what we have today is an increasing model kind of political democracy. Precisely at a time when in the U.S. (and I think in other countries such as Britain, France and what we would call the

Post-Industrial countries), many of the basic democratic values of the model democratic state are put increasingly into question. Not only put into question by Marxists or by people on the left but also by ordinary people to whom the democratic system as we have it in the U.S. is not really satisfying. This is a basic point which is demonstrated in the last election here in the U.S. and also in election in other countries. The notion is that the "outs," somehow, have a built-in advantage as compared to the "ins" in the government. This is part and parcel of this kind of dissatisfaction the public really has.

Finally, going again back to the Schwartz paper, some of the traditional groups, and in the U.S. those basically are the trade unions and the churches, are no longer very relevant to the concerns of the public. I don't want to get into a dispute here with the trade unions because I know every summer, right in this very room, the United Auto Workers has its seminars. But basically all of these organizations are for themselves. They are pushing participation to maximize their own benefit, so that the trade unions are interested in maximizing the kind of participation within the union but not the kind of participation which many people feel is effective. The churches are doing the same, perhaps even more so. It is no accident that in the Watergate crisis, when we needed participation most of all, the only two church leaders that I can remember by name were Rabbi Korff and Father McLaughlin. The churches are pro domo, whether it is the Catholic Church, which is mostly interested now in something they call Right to Life, or the Synagogue, which is mostly interested in pushing the state of Israel. They are not really, it seems to me, developing modes of participation which can effectively work against the kinds of the things that Dr. Anderson was talking about - the overloaded government, the lack of efficient service delivery the people want and deserve and ought to have at low cost. We need to look for new modes of participation. I wish Ed Schwartz a lot of luck in some of these new groups that he mentioned, but it seems to me that somewhere in the adult world there ought to be some new methods, some new groups that ought to spring up, that are not always pushing for their own selfish goals which many of the current organizations of interest groups are doing.

Finally, we need much more research data on the nature and the kind of participation. I am not entirely clear that when we talk about "participation" all of us really mean the same thing. We get back to Dr. Schmidt-Sinns' comment that to many of us different words have different meanings. There ought to be a lot more empirical data in the U.S. and in Germany as well, as to the kinds of participation that people want to have, ought to have, and that we are talking about here.

Engle: Thank you very much, Mr. Foster, Mr. Anderson, for those thoughtful reactions. I will start this question period by asking Mr. Schmidt-Sinns and Mr. Schwartz if they have any reactions.

Schmidt-Sinns: I was particularly interested in what was said about the citizen movements in the U.S. I didn't mention them because of my focus on programs, but we also have them in Germany, and they have grown rather strong in recent years, particularly because of the problem of nuclear energy. The FRG is building, or at least planning, quite a number of nuclear plants. And if I may draw your attention to the fact that we are talking about a country the size of Colorado, in which we have crammed together great industrial capacity, you know what sort of environmental problems we face. Now, these citizen action groups are important in regard to political education or, better, political activities.

The one problem I see is the question of action - political action and political learning in connection with these citizen action groups. As one theory has it in connection with the students movements, there could be action phases and learning phases, one after the

other, - hopefully non-violent. But there seems to be a contradiction between the affective and the cognitive side of the political behavior. In our citizen action groups there is the danger now of having anarchists and terrorists mingling in and trying to turn the whole movement against the system. Then police will react with force, and so the learning process will not take place. The citizen movement is a significant factor today. It is already institutionalized. There is a national organization of these "Bürgerinitiativen," and political parties will have to take them into account.

Schwartz: I think the question of whether the development of political education is in response to political developments, or is merely part of a broader cultural phenomenon of adult education of all kinds, is an interesting one. The kind of person that comes to a class in political education is a different kind of person from one who just comes to a class in auto mechanics or a class in the great books. I would argue from my experience that this is the case. The demand for political education is far less than for educational programs in general. In my own area the LaSalle College runs something called a "Communiversity," which is a framework for adult courses. The courses cover everything from philosophy to weatherizing homes. Up to this past year they have not actually offered a political education course. Now, this year we did offer a political education course and we got a fairly substantial turnout. The people who came were divided into two groups. One group were those who knew the instructor directly, because he'd taught there before and they liked him. Another group was there because they'd heard about it not through the communiversity but through us in other places and wanted specific political training. When people who came for a more generalized educational experience realized that we were really talking about political action, they filtered away. And so there was some attrition in the class. The same thing has been true in a couple of other programs that I've been running that also cooperate with broader adult education operations. If I had raised the question of even starting such a program five years ago, in the average high school or university extension program, no one would have been interested. Yet those programs had a very elaborate educational outreach long before this movement for political education occurred. So, I'm just hunching that if you're going to look at political education you do have to look at it as a response to political events and political crises and not simply as related to education extension programs in general. The second point that I would raise - this gets to both what Lee Anderson and Charles Foster have said - is the question of individualism. The kind of courses - not political courses - that some people are taking in response to crises, are another way of showing how the anti-political systems influence our way of responding. I do believe that the social contract has broken down. But that contract was not simply individualism because obviously something has to reconcile the war of these individuals against one another. In Smith's ideology it was the invisible hand. In modern America, it's been growth. As long as growth had proceeded adequately you did not worry about the conflicts between individuals. Recently, growth has not been sufficient to reconcile those conflicts, so people feel powerless. But I would say, and agree with Lee Anderson in this sense, that far more people are seeking <u>private</u> solutions rather than <u>public</u> solutions to that feeling of powerlessness.

Let me give you two examples. One is the whole growth of encounter movements, self-awareness, transactional analysis, and other similar activities. All of it has grown up in the past five or six years. All of it reflects deep feelings of frustration and impotence on the part of those who attend them. All of them get massive turnouts, and I periodically contemplate how my institute can reorient what we do to feel into the psychological frustrations that are driving people to these programs. I described to a group the other day that I would have to lose about sixty pounds, and wear a black

turtle-neck and get beads and grow a beard and wear my hair longer and look a little more wild-eyed, and then suddenly we'd have this huge following. I'd talk about consciousness and the need to relate to yourself and to get it all together, and this sort of thing. All of these themes are very popular in a culture that believes that if something goes wrong there is an individual, private way that can more or less solve it. If you haven't solved it, somehow it's your own private fault. So, it's cheaper than therapy, and obviously those who are getting into it are making an awful lot of money. But I think it is part of the kind of privatized response to this crisis that we're talking about.

At a more practical and perhaps less lucrative level, there is no question that the legal education movement in the adult world is doing rather well. If you go into worker education programs sponsored by Penn State or elsewhere, the most popular course is on labor law. There is a national street law academy, and there are all sorts of books now on the market on consumer law and similar topics. Well, why is that? It's a question of power. People may feel it is futile to go down to City Hall and try to influence the local administration, and they may feel the same about Congress, but if they can only learn the law, then they could go to court and the court will enforce the law. It is an outgrowth of the situation during the last fifteen years where a good many of the political issues have been solved, in a sense, in the courts. So we deal with two kinds of response to the crisis that are not really political in the sense I was talking about: a personal, private response, and a legal response. That gets at the question of individualism.

Now the issue that Dr. Foster raises is: Can we move beyond them? I would be the last person to say that what the churches and the unions are doing is adequate to accomplish the task. I certainly agree that they are not up to what I think ought to be done. However, I would say they have been doing more in the length of time they've been challenged than the universities did ten years ago when I raised the question there as a student activist. But, obviously, this society is not geared to the kind of participatory democracy that I have always favored, I'm not sure it really can be participatory in pure form, but institutions don't really think that is important. So they resist it. Yet there is more going on now then there was then. In the church's case I think it's a bit unfair to take the issue of Watergate as the main example. There is no question that the Civil Rights Movement e.g., was built by southern black churches and completely supported by churches throughout the country. And the anti-war movement found its greatest support in the U.S., outside of the university, from the churches. They have in the past twenty years been a very important source for social change. What's happened is that over the last six years they simply have not known what to do because the constituency that supported the anti-war and civil rights movements is not the constituency that attends their congregations. And there has been an enourmous backlash about that in every denomination. That is why they've had to retrench somewhat.

But what's interesting to me now about both of these groups and the other citizen groups I described is not simply that they are getting into action but they are getting into education to promote the kind of broader perspective. After all, unions have been around for years, so have churches and civic groups. They have not necessarily had the kind of community education programs I'm describing or discussing. But what Dr. Foster raises as well gets beyond the question of politics as the goals of politics. I mean, after all, from the standpoint of political education within American liberal thought there should be nothing wrong with a group simply educating its members around their self-interest. All self-interest may not be selfish or all selfish interest may not necessarily be unjust. If the union goes out for its self-interest at the bargaining table, whether that is a good self-interest or bad one depends on many factors. To simply condemn it all to selfishness, I think, sidesteps many of the important moral questions.

Whether or not you can come up with a moral answer depends on your definition of morality,

and here's where we turn back to the question that Lee Anderson raises very nicely. That is, what is the alternative to individualism? Yes, that has been a value within our culture. It has been a strong value. But it was not the only value in the minds of those who framed the Declaration, nor was it the only value that was promoted in civic movements in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, and, in fact, in the people's movements that exist in this country today. The alternative is not rooted in the notion of individualism but in cooperation and equality. The belief was that the country really should be a decentralized confederation of relatively small communities each with the political power to control their own moral behavior, and all working for a more or less cooperative commonwealth built around equality of substance and not simply of opportunity. The question of whether we can find an alternative to individualism is one that throws us back on the traditional political issues. One reason for today's complexity is that people have no place to turn. They are, in Durkheim's formulation, normalists. They have no values to guide them, or rather, the only values that have a chance of guiding them are the familiar ones. As Chesterton put it, people will always move slowly and cautiously to something they find complex and unusual. If you wish them to riot, it must be on the behalf of something respectable. What I try to do is find those traditional values that are respectable but whose betrayal has caused people to riot.

Engle: Now, it's time for questions and comments.

Stratmann: I think both of you talked about apathy, particularly in regard to the unions as a major potential factor in political education. If you look at West Germany, the metal-workers union has increased its education program by something like 60% in the last four years, yet it is still not getting a sufficient number of participants. From my own dealings with the trade union membership, I believe that the reason isn't always apathy--and you indicated yourself that there may be underlying structural reasons. One of them is a very simple one. The fact is that if I am engaged in production line work from 8:00 A.M. til 5:00 P.M. or on shift work til 6:00 A.M. and if I have a tremendous desire to educate myself, it is impossible because I have a family of five children. Therefore I'm practically unable to take advantage of its opportunities.

Schwartz: I absolutely agree with that. I raise the question of apathy because it always comes up. I made the comment in passing that it's a matter of blaming the victim. If the society is organized in such a way that the major part of our time is to be spent in an institution that's going to pay us - in exchange for which we have no comment for its behavior internally, no ability to participate or discuss at the work place, and we believe that in fact the government can do almost nothing to control it anyway - then we may be very angry at it, but we just decide that there is nothing we can do and we don't have the time to do it, if we could. And it seems to me that the solution to apathy is not simply raving people up. Ralph Nader runs around talking as if everybody had two or three hours every night, and if only they wouldn't sit by the television set and rather go out into the streets and start organizing, we could overthrow the country. Well, if everyone went to Princeton and had his training there that might look like a cleaner option than most people feel that they have. So, it is a structural problem and it's one that anybody interested in organizing has to overcome. It is a problem to which political education must respond. You are still trying to get people to see the structural reasons why their neighbors might be apathetic, and then try to cope with it.

Stanley: Professor Anderson may well be correct that the crisis that our society is in has no solution and that only disaster lies ahead. Indeed, I made some comments on that as long ago as 1953. But I'm not ready, as I'm sure a great many Americans are not ready, to give up on the basic and essential values of democracy, and I'd like to say to Professor Anderson: to assume that the crisis is insoluble, that nothing remains but disaster, is the surest way that I know to guarantee disaster.

Anderson: I always get in trouble.
Question: Dr. Schmidt-Sinns, what safeguards are necessary to prevent political education from becoming partisan education, especially in a country where education and the mass media are, if not government-sponsored, at least government overseen, so to speak. I remember, last year, for instance, when the German elections took place here, there was much criticism of the federal government because some of the information which came out in the name of political education was really Social Democrat or Free Democrat education.
Schmidt-Sinns: There was criticism against the Press and Information Office of the government. The courts ruled that our government, and not only the federal government but also the governments in the different states, misused the funds given them for public information. You asked for the safeguards. We exercise the principle of parity, of balanced representation in the control boards of our electronic media and in other institutions so as to provide guarantees that information is not one-sided. And the press is very important in this regard. Nevertheless, there are certain dangers for democracy and the democratic way of life in the present German situation. You in the United States have experienced Watergate, and we have had our own "bug affair." Our Minister of the Interior allowed the secret service to place bugs in a private house because there was the danger that its owner, an atomic scientist,was connected with terrorists, and that he could transmit atomic knowledge to terrorists. Though the state could have been in danger, the whole affair turned out to be nothing but an error. So you see that the state, the all powerful state, violated a basic human right which shouldn't be done. The danger of this happening is growing more and more in every state. I do believe that there are quite a number of safeguards but there are no absolute safeguards. The press in Germany has proved to be the most effective safeguard because they report what happens, and the same is true in the United States.
Engle: I recognize Professor Anderson to respond to Professor Stanley ...
Anderson: As usual, in retrospect, I think I miscommunicated. I'm not solely pessimistic. I'm simply arguing that there may be grounds for optimism that go beyond our secular religion. That's one point. The point I was trying to make was that one way of looking at adult political education is to see it as an extension of something we tried time after time in the case of the schools. As things get more complex we demand more education. And as it becomes increasingly clear that the schools can't carry the entire burden over the life cycle of an individual, we ask more and more institutions outside of schools to get into the education business. Now, one of the problems I have with this is that when we come to the structural problems, problems that are in effect created by the way the society is ordered, then does more and more education in fact, lead to a solution? My argument is that there are a great number of kids in American society now, in high schools particularly, who are getting an excellent structural education. They are learning what that structure is all about, and as they learn what it is all about they do one of two things: A few in effect try to develop their bureaucratic efficacy and learn the skills of manipulating the system. That 's one thing. Some say, in effect (and I'll be autobiographical with my son, in this case), "god damn it, I don't want to play the system that way. It's a lousy system and to simply learn the skills to play it is to perpetuate it, when in fact my obligation is to do everything I can to undermine it without getting in so much trouble that my parents become completely embarassed with me." And so in effect, more of education about the structural problems leads very frequently not to solutions to these problems but to the despair, to the hopelessness, to the sense of powerlessness and ultimately, I think, to the growth of social irresponsibility. So, all I'm challenging is whether or not this talk about adult education - and I don't know whether I'm serious or not - isn't simply an extension of the American myth that education can solve everything.

Baran: I have a comment on the role of adult education. Although being crucially important, I think adult education is basically a bandaid in approaching the problem of political education. The schools are all in the anti-political systems to a far greater extent than we have given them credit for. The generic question is not of complexity or the breakdown of the anti-political systems but rather is a more fundamental metaphysical and moral question. This question is whether a man is an active or reactive organism. Schools' attitudes about the learner and the learning process have profound political implications. Do we view the students as active participants in determining the content and process of their education or as passive recipients? Can we educate people to be active, participatory democrats in an autocratic school system? Autocratic refers not only to administration and management but more basically to the psychological assumptions which lead us to view the learner as being a passive recipient.

Massialas: The last question was the one that really has not been addressed. I think that one of the failures of our programs is the fact that we have a very narrow concept of politics in the political process. All the four panelists have talked on the systemic level. They talked about the government, they talked about stability and change, and yet, as has been mentioned, there is this political process of human interactions that involve vital objects between two people and divisions in the neighborhood, in the family. We have looked at political education at the systemic level with the legal structures and participation through unions, through business organizations, through the opinions of mayors and governors and presidents, but have not looked where the political process really takes place. That takes place in everyday life, during every minute in which two humans interact. If we continue having this orientation, I don't think our political education, or political participation, or political efficacy of people is going to change. It's going to be unrelated and irrelevant. Unless there's a change to direct our attention to the individual at the micro level, at the level where the individual performs every day, all our political programs are bound to be ineffective.

Foster: I couldn't agree with you more but I'm very much opposed to getting away from politics in a broad sense. When somebody asked Senator Francis Theodore Green when he was ninety how he felt, he said "Pretty good considering the alternative!" That's the way I feel about politics. To me there is no alternative to politics. Incidently, the Civil Service Comissioner, to show you the powerlessness of the bureaucrats, is now offering transactional meditation or transactional analysis as a free training course for bureaucrats. Well, that may indicate the powerlessness of the bureaucrats, but that to me is not a training course that ought to be offered to anybody in the political process. When you start talking about psychology, and you're talking about pot, and you're talking about some of these other cop-outs of the society, I don't agree with it. But I agree 100% with Byron Massialas that it is inadequate to talk about politics in those structural terms. We have to talk about it much more broadly. I don't agree with the pessimism of Lee Anderson that we can't develop new forms of getting at some of these problems.

Baran: I think we can view the educational process as the political process. We're talking about training citizens to become causal active agents in society but in the training process they're not allowed to be causal active agents. I think you're cutting down the potential of that citizen before you can get him in the adult edult education class. I don't know whether he's going to be able to rebound from those 18 years of being a receptive, passive learner everyday.

Foster: I probably misunderstood because you were then sort of talking about psychology.

Baran: Well, psychology is crucial because the way we see the learner as being active or passive - and in school systems we see them as very passive organisms - is going to have a profound effect on his political activity.

Foster: Well, I think that's true.
Question: Professor Anderson's comments about his son and the part of Dr. Schmidt-Sinns' paper dealing with the family prompt me to ask for some comment on the place of the family in political education.
Schwartz: I think all institutions have an impact on our values and attitudes, and I certainly believe that the school is an anti-political institution and what you're saying is what we said ten years ago with students. The issue is, what do you do as an alternative? One of the problems that one faces is the redefinition of politics, because the three alternatives I've heard are private, not public, and I would urge you to go back and read Sheldon Walden's Politics in Vision for a summary of how liberal corporate society has redefined politics. The people I work with, who are ordinary people, do come out and work in communities and at the work place, and they are fighting for change, and they feel apathy and selfishness has left them powerless. The powerlessness they feel is not in their interactions with other people. It is in their relations with the government of the United States and their City Hall.
Comment: I disagree.
Schwartz: Well, you disagree, but you don't have much evidence on your side. I could take you to city after city where the movements I'm talking about have arisen. One of the great games that's played in corporate institutions is to try suddenly to redefine movements for power into personalized terms so that it will always reduce to making people feel good about one another. A great example of that was what Charles Reich did to the student movement in The Greening of America. For ten or fifteen years people were fighting for power to end the war in Vietnam, and to create justice in this country. And Charles Reich ...
Massialas: They were making noise on these corporate institutions.
Schwartz: Some did because they failed and they failed because they knew nothing as an alternative. The only alternative that was projected was a sort of spontaneous libidinous, creative, active individual. But the critical problem against the corporate state is how those individuals get together and organize for change. That is a problem of power and no other.
Now to the question of the family. The family will not compete with a corporate economy unless it, too, works together with other families. Obviously, whatever attitudes we're talking about must be inculcated by all institutions. But the debate in fact is between those of you who believe that privatized solutions are going to rescue us from public problems, and those of us who believe that privatized solutions are part of the problem.
Engle: With this comment we will have to close our discussion session. Thank you all very much for your participation.